

AUGUSTA HISTORICAL BULLETIN



Published by the
AUGUSTA COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Volume 2

Number 1

AUGUSTA HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Published by
AUGUSTA COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Founded 1964
Box 86, Kable Station
Staunton, Virginia 24402



Volume 2

Number 1

400 Copies printed by
McCLURE PRINTING COMPANY
Staunton, Virginia

Copies of this issue to all members

Contents

“AUGUSTA COUNTY’S RELATION TO THE REVOLUTION”
—Address of Dr. Howard McK. Wilson. Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Augusta County Historical Society, Staunton, Virginia, Wednesday, November 10, 1965.

“LEE AND JACKSON”—Address of Dr. Marshall Moore Brice. Delivered for Lee-Jackson Day, Staunton Kiwanis Club, January 17, 1966.

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

MEMBERS

A purpose of the Augusta County Historical Society is to publish *Augusta Historical Bulletin* to be sent without charge to all members. Single issues are available at \$1.00 per copy.

The membership of the society is composed of annual and life members who pay the following dues:

Annual (individual)	\$5.00
Annual (family)	\$8.00
Annual (sustaining)	\$25.00
Life Membership	\$100.00
Annual (Institutional)	\$10.00
Contributing—Any amount	

AUGUSTA COUNTY'S RELATION TO THE REVOLUTION

Address of Dr. Howard McK. Wilson
Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the
AUGUSTA COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Wednesday, November 10, 1965

"What made the American farmers fight in 1775?" asks one of our most distinguished living historians. He supplies a forthright answer from a 91-year-old veteran of the Concord fight in the Massachusetts Colony in 1775. He said, "What we meant in going for those redcoats was this: we always had governed ourselves, and we always meant to. They didn't mean we should."¹

The loyalty of the mid-18th century American colonist is documented thoroughly. Great Britain was a colonial empire and the Americans were a proud part of it for more than a hundred and fifty years. There was no nationalist, or separatist, movement such as those known in the twentieth century. However, America felt she had grown up. There were, therefore, conflicting interests to be mediated and vital political questions to be answered. The mother country thought—as many others do—she could resolve the conflicts and answer the questions better without consultation with the child. But the child, having come of age, thought differently and a clash of arms resulted in the Revolution.

We are concerned specifically with Augusta County's relation to the Revolution for independence. The German and Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania were encouraged to settle the Valley of Virginia beginning about 1730 and were given freedom of worship as dissenters upon assurances of "unspotted fidelity to our gracious sovereign King George."² The two counties west of the Blue Ridge, Augusta and Frederick, were authorized in 1738. The settlers prior to 1770 ranged all the way to the Ohio River, and Staunton was the county seat where their court cases were handled. This old Augusta County court sat for at least one session in the area of present Pittsburgh. The only pre-Revolutionary division of Augusta came when Botetourt County

was set off in 1770 to cover Southwestern Virginia and the present Kentucky area.

In the French and Indian War, 1754-1763, the fidelity of the frontiersman was put to the test. Lieutenant Governor Dinwiddie, sensing the significance of the controversy over the "Gateway at the Forks" of the Ohio, determined to strengthen the forces there.³ In January, 1754, he wrote Colonel James Patton, head of the Augusta militia, ordering a "Draft" of fifty men. The response was not good. In fact, by 1755, many were fleeing the county, asking why they should fight Indians while other Virginians were safe east of the Blue Ridge. James Patton replied that the understanding between the Colonial Council of Virginia and the Valley settlers must be honored. Mr. Patton's pastor, Rev. John Craig, with whom he often disagreed, now came to his support with enthusiasm saying: to yield to fear and flee the frontier would be a reproach among Virginians, a dishonor to friends in Great Britain, an evidence of cowardice, a want of faith in God, and a lasting blot to posterity. The Valley entered the French and Indian War with the Scotch-Irish taking the lead.⁴

The war was fought and won but with heavy losses. The Preston Register for Augusta County, 1754-1758, names more than a hundred killed and almost two hundred wounded and/or taken prisoner from Indian raids on the Virginia frontier.⁵ The Treaty in 1763 divided the French possessions in America between the English and Spanish. Unfortunately the treaty did not relieve the frontier of tension. Indian incursions did not cease and white settlements on land reserved for Indians continued.

Early in 1765 ten friendly Cherokee Indians came to the home of Colonel Andrew Lewis, head of the county militia, and secured passes to travel north for the purpose of joining others to fight the Ohio Indians. On their first night out, while sleeping in Anderson's barn (now Verona), five of them were murdered, including their leader and the son of a former tribal chief. The friendly Cherokee nation was at once assured of trial and punishment of the offenders. Two of the murderers were arrested. But an organized mob delivered them from the hands

of the law, claiming that men who killed "savages" were not murderers. There followed a period of anarchy when an outlaw gang, called The Augusta Boys, offered a reward for the arrest of Colonel Lewis and his law enforcement associates. The criminals were never brought to justice.⁶

There were irritating differences between the frontier settlers and the eastern-controlled government. But the Valley people were relatively happy as a part of "the body politic of the Old Dominion." These frontiersmen had served something of an "apprenticeship in independence," both political and religious. In the meantime the colonial government had offered "bounty lands" on the frontier as a reward to those who fought the Indians. This led many second generation Germans and Scotch-Irish to move west into the Ohio watershed. Treaties and government policies were reasonably clear, but they did not settle the real issue—would the Ohio Valley be hunting grounds for the red man or homesteads for land-hungry pioneers?⁷

While these frontier events were in progress, more vital changes were beginning along the Atlantic coast. By the end of the French and Indian War on the frontier "there had been worked out a compromise between imperial control and colonial self-government; between the principle of authority and the principle of liberty. . . . Americans were satisfied with this compromise in 1763. But the government of George III was not."⁸ War debts had piled up and a standing army in America was costly for the home government. Since the American Colonies had benefited, the British thought it fair for them to help bear the tax load. Students of early America are agreed that the colonies might have consented to taxation if they had been consulted; but they were not.

It was by authoritative decree that the English Parliament passed one legislative act after another imposing taxes on America: The Sugar Act on imported sugar; The Stamp Act on all paper work, legal and public; The Townshend Act on paints, glass, and India tea; and The Quartering Act requiring colonials to supply room in their homes for English soldiers stationed in the colonies.

Every one of these Acts was resisted. Against them Samuel Adams supplied propaganda, John Hancock sparked the financing, and the "Sons of Liberty" groups harassed those wishing to comply. Every subject became a political issue and divided coastal towns and communities between Colonial Patriots, called Whigs, and British Loyalists, called Tories.⁹ In the pros and cons at Norfolk, Virginia, for example, when inoculation for smallpox was begun, the Patriots took one side, the Loyalists took the other—and gangs played havoc with the innocent. The British ministry backed down on all these taxes except the tax on tea. However, Britain had passed a Declaratory Act which said that she could impose any tax on the colonies she chose.

The manner in which the British Government reacted to the supplications for relief and refusals to obey angered the colonials as nothing else had done. In the case of Massachusetts, the Colonial Secretary in dictatorial fashion ordered the Assembly to rescind its circular letter of protest, and, in case they refused, the governor was ordered to dismiss them. The Assembly did refuse by a vote of almost eight to one!¹⁰ In a similar manner, the British, as if flouting the American view on taxation, ordered the New York Legislature to comply with the Quartering Act in its entirety or be dismissed by the governor. They were dismissed.

All the actions we have mentioned, and many others, were overshadowed, and the American sentiment for resistance climaxed in 1773 when a group of Bostonians, disguised as Indians, dumped 340 chests of tea in Boston Harbor. There is some local pride in Augusta County that cherishes the credit that one Augusta man was in that riot.¹¹ The British government responded in anger, again without even considering, much less consulting, the Americans on the principle our history books call "taxation without representation." Three months after the "Boston Tea Party," the port was closed. The city was ordered to re-imburse the owners and award damages to the custom officers injured in the riot.

Virginia, along with other colonies, gave hearty support to Boston's resistance. On May 24, 1774, the House of Burgesses at Williamsburg proceeded to offer aid and declared June

1st, the day the Boston Port Bill would go into effect, as a day of fasting and prayer, whereupon Governor Dunmore dissolved the House. The members promptly reassembled at nearby Raleigh Tavern in Williamsburg and called for a boycott of the India Tea Company and urged the calling of an annual congress of all colonies to deliberate on those general measures which the united interest of America might from time to time require.¹²

All the colonies concurred, except Georgia, and the first Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia September 5, 1774. They petitioned the King, addressed the English people, and planned an economic boycott of trade with England—but in all of these actions left the door open for consultation.

The early part of 1774 the House of Burgesses in Virginia took action of special interest to the frontiersmen. In view of continued conflict over land in the Ohio watershed, Lord Dunmore reported on the Indian horrors.¹³ He secured authorization for resistance and took personal charge of an expedition against the Indian towns beyond the Ohio River. The recruiting was done west of the Blue Ridge, with the governor heading the recruits from the northern Valley counties, Frederick and the two counties of Dunmore (later Shenandoah) and Berkeley, set off from Frederick in 1772. Colonel Andrew Lewis did the recruiting and headed the southern Valley militias. The governor was to take his men on a northern route, while the Lewis forces would travel by way of the Greenbrier River. They were later to unite their forces for attack.¹⁴

Colonel Lewis arrived and camped at Point Pleasant where the Kanawha River empties into the Ohio. On October 10, 1774—incidentally it was the end of the sixth week of deliberations by the First Continental Congress—the Indians under Chief Cornstalk of the Shawnees made a surprise attack upon Point Pleasant. Except for early-rising deer hunters from the camp, the Lewis army would likely have been slaughtered in their blanket beds. But after a fierce, day-long battle and heavy losses on both sides the Indians withdrew.¹⁵

Subsequently Colonel Lewis received various conflicting

orders from Dunmore. But after caring for the dead and wounded, he began his advance toward the Indian towns for an attack and was joined enroute by Dunmore and his army. At this point the record becomes blurred, for neither Dunmore nor Lewis ever made an official report. But there are facts that seem to be beyond dispute—though the interpretations of these facts differ widely. First, Governor Dunmore contacted the Indians and began a powwow instead of an attack. Second, he ordered Colonel Lewis and his forces to return home lest he embarrass the negotiations with the Indians!¹⁶ Third, the governor ended the Indian powwow and returned to Williamsburg without any kind of known Indian treaty or agreement. And, fourth, having used Fort Pitt as headquarters—it was then a disputed area claimed by both Pennsylvania and Virginia—Dunmore appointed personal cronies to be in charge and renamed it Fort Dunmore. Interpretations by historians vary on his actions from traitor to benefactor. Whatever his purpose, or the inescapable circumstances, there were results. This war experience, with new severe restrictions on the sale of western land, caused Dunmore to lose the confidence of Virginia. The frontiersman looked upon him with suspicion and anger.¹⁷ All of this happened while the First Continental Congress was in session. The whole of the Virginia Colony turned more to that congress for leadership, and the Valley Patriots in their inurement to war resolved never to surrender their rights as *British* subjects to any power upon earth but at the expense of their lives.

It is of interest to note those who headed resolution committees that expressed Valley support for resistance to English pressure. The Rev. Charles M. Thruston, rector of Frederick parish, presided over the committee at Winchester in Frederick County.¹⁸ A week later Rev. Peter Muhlenberg, then serving as Lutheran and Anglican clergyman in Dunmore County (now Shenandoah), was chairman of that county committee.

In Staunton, the Anglican rector of Augusta Parish, an Edinburgh Scot, Alexander Balmaine, headed the Augusta committee.¹⁹ Other members were Michael Bowyer, William Lewis, George Mathews, Sampson Mathews, and Alexander McClanahan. The committee, having been commissioned by the free-

holders to do so, chose Thomas Lewis and Samuel McDowell as delegates to the Colony Convention of 1775. Instructions to the representatives affirm that they may consider the people of Augusta County as firmly fixed in "loyalty and allegiance to his Majesty King George, whose title to the imperial crown of Great Britain rests on no other foundation than the liberty . . . of all his subjects. . . . These rights," they continue in speaking of conscience and natural rights, "we are fully resolved, with our lives and fortunes, inviolably to preserve, nor will we surrender . . . to any Parliament, or any body of men upon earth, by whom we are not represented, and in whose decisions, therefore, we have no voice."²⁰

The Valley population in 1763, from the Potomac River to present Roanoke, was estimated at 21,000—that is one thousand less than the Staunton census in 1960. By 1776 the Valley population had increased to an estimated 53,000—that is only eighteen less than the combined Waynesboro and Augusta County census in 1960.²¹

Along with scattered families of Swiss and French, the Valley population's smallest discernible percentage estimate in 1776 was Dutch. For each Dutch Hollander there were proportionally 3 Negroes, 6 Englishmen, 23 Germans and 34 Irish of Scottish descent. Augusta County was 10 per cent English, 10 per cent Negro, 20 per cent German, and 60 per cent Scotch-Irish.²² North of Augusta County Germans were more numerous, except in Frederick and Berkeley counties, and to the south the Scotch-Irish percentage increased significantly. They were, however, united in resistance to British imperial decrees.

It was Patrick Henry's war cry "Give me liberty or give me death" that called America to battle. Committees of Safety governed each county under provisional assemblies. For Virginia the trend to war approached the point of no return when Lord Dunmore removed the colony's powder from Williamsburg to a man-of-war in the harbor. But even then, on the basis of victory at Point Pleasant, the Burgesses tried in vain to resume a normal relationship with the governor. In response, he replied with a sharp indictment of the Virginia leaders, to which the House of Burgesses replied in kind giving "its valedictory in

Doughty married Layton Yancey, Father of Col. W.B. Yancey, father of Capt. W.B., father of F.W., father of Layton W. Yancey to my Grandfather

a series of resolutions.”²³ A year later came the Declaration of Independence and the War of Revolution.

Andrew Lewis was chosen, because of experience rather than rank, to take charge of the Virginia troops and was made a brigadier general in 1776. Supported by Valley troops, his first service was to drive Governor Dunmore from Gwynn’s Island, where he had gathered several hundred men, including soldiers, loyalists and Negroes.²⁴

From the beginning the Valley, and particularly the County of Augusta, provided supplies for the war. One hundred and thirty barrels of flour went to Boston when the besieged city ran short on rations. In the year 1779 foods for British prisoners in Staunton were listed as 40,000 pounds of flour and meal, 33,000 pounds of beef, and smaller quantities of other foods. For the Yorktown Campaign, the Valley supplied 200,000 pounds of flour and 10,000 bushels of wheat for the forces.²⁵

Patrick Henry wrote to George Washington saying, “In a very little time seven companies were made up in Augusta.”²⁶ The leadership is summarized, by a student of the Valley’s part in the Revolution, as six generals and five hundred other officers—of whom two hundred were captains.²⁷ Three generals who are of special interest to Augusta were Andrew Lewis, William Campbell, and George Mathews. Others, either lieutenant colonels or colonels, were William Bowyer, Charles Lewis, Samuel Lewis, Alexander McClanahan, George Moffett and William Preston.

Consider the enlistment record in the declaration made by William Wilson. In 1774 he volunteered in Staunton and was in the battle at Point Pleasant. He returned home in five months. Again in 1776 he enlisted at Lexington in a company going to the Holston River. This time he saw no combat and returned home in a few months. Then five years later, in 1781, he enlisted at Widow Teas (now Waynesboro). They marched to Richmond, to Fredericksburg, and to Portsmouth. In the latter place they had two skirmishes with the British. He was home again after three months duty. Though never a commis-

sioned officer, like a multitude of others in Staunton, rank was later conferred and he was known as Major William Wilson,²⁸

This was not military service as we know it. Captains were often appointed and commissioned to raise men to fill the ranks. Enlistment was not continuous, but rather for one campaign—often extended to other fields of operation, to be sure. But frequently the soldier returned home, carrying his own squirrel rifle with him, to plant or harvest his crop.

As in other Virginia counties not all Augusta men were patriots. Some soldiers deserted the ranks and returned home. There were two groups of Tories: a small group who gave active assistance to the British cause, and a much larger number who found themselves out of sympathy with the objectives of the war and kept quiet.²⁹

The most conspicuous Tory in Augusta County was a deposed Presbyterian minister, Mr. Alexander Millar, an outspoken Ulster Scot.³⁰ He charged the Augusta Safety Committee with being traitors, and the committee responded by recommending that the people have nothing to do with him. But later, when the Augusta Committee, under a State Assembly order, was organized as a county court, he did not fare so well. They had him brought from Indian Creek, Botetourt County, and tried, July 16-17, 1776. He was found guilty of “aiding and giving intelligence to the enemy.”³¹ The court ordered him isolated on his own plantation, where he was not to argue or reason with any person or persons whatsoever on any political subject.

However, on April 19, 1777, upon the election of Squire John Poage to public office, Mr. Millar wrote him a letter in opposition to the Revolutionary Cause. He argued for “peace and safety,” contending that “we are unfit to conflict with Britain and to claim independence appears . . . wrong” because of declared allegiance. A postscript to the letter suggests that Mr. Poage might publish the letter under the title, “A letter to a gentleman on his being elected a Burgess.”³²

The letter was taken instead to the Justice of Peace, and Mr. Millar was charged in open defiance of an Act of the As-

sembly of Virginia passed in October 1776: The jury found him guilty as charged and assessed "a fine of one hundred pounds and two years' imprisonment."³³ The last record in the case is a petition by his wife in 1778, asking for his transfer from the Staunton jail to the jail in the new County of Rockingham where it would be more convenient for her to supply him with the "necessities of life." The request was denied. The new County of Rockingham, where the noted lawyer, Gabriel Jones, was sitting out the war without commitment to either side, had in a five-year period about a dozen treason trials. In Frederick County in 1778 ninety-three persons were summoned to court for refusing to give an account of their taxable property and reckoned as opposing the new state government. The first treason trial in new Rockbridge County in 1778 was a charge against Mary Walker. In the Valley counties, however, there was no armed resistance, as other colonies experienced.

The Valley was once threatened by invasion. After Cornwallis invaded the Virginia Colony, Tarleton, with his British dragoons, made, in 1781, an attempt to capture the Virginia Legislature. They, however, were on the move. On May 10, 1781, they adjourned in Richmond to meet in Charlottesville on the 24th, and from there adjourned to meet in Staunton June 7th. Tarleton was able to pick up only a few scattered members when he arrived in Charlottesville on June 4th. The presence of Tarleton in Charlottesville in pursuit of the legislature, who then were fleeing to the Valley, led to the conjecture and report that Tarleton would invade the Valley.³⁴

The first specific rumor seems to have spread Saturday, June 9th. On Sunday, the 10th, the Tinkling Spring Congregation had assembled for regular worship services, to be led by the pastor, Rev. James Waddell. They had no doubt discussed, as they gathered, the rumor of Tarleton's threat. The congregation was panic-stricken when there was brought to the church a stranger dressed partly in a British soldier's uniform. He had been captured nearby. This man, they were told, was one of four supposedly sent as spies to the Valley by Tarleton.³⁵ Excitement ran high. The pastor urged the congregation to secure arms and hasten to Rockfish Gap. He startled his family by getting his own gun down on the Sabbath day.

Joseph Long, who lived near Stuarts Draft, having brought his rifle to Church, volunteered to take the prisoner to the Staunton jail while others secured arms and spread the alarm. The prisoner moved in obedience to orders until they reached the Christian Creek ford. There, Long wished to take off his moccasins, but the spy continued ahead, wading the creek in his jack-boots. Long repeatedly called upon him to halt, but he continued and was shot. After a few days he died, having confessed to spying for Tarleton.

From the Forks of the James, shortly to be incorporated as Lexington, to Peaked Mountain, at the end of the Massanutten range, people were aroused. The men and boys gathered in Blue Ridge Mountain passes with weapons varying from rifles to rocks. Tarleton did not advance farther than Charlottesville; so some of the militia companies that had assembled went in quest of the enemy and joined Lafayette below Charlottesville.³⁵ Among them were companies whose captains were William Finley, Zechariah Johnston, Francis Long and James Bell. The campaigns in eastern Virginia moved steadily to Cornwallis' surrender to Washington on October 19, 1781, at Yorktown.

The Assembly men in Staunton on June 10th were almost as near panic as the populace. They met hurriedly on that Monday morning to enter an adjournment to Warm Springs, and fled so hastily, according to tradition, that Patrick Henry left wearing only one boot! But they returned two days later. Thomas Jefferson's term as governor had expired June 1st, and a member of the Council, William Fleming, was acting governor for about two weeks, "holding his court," in Staunton. The town was familiar ground for Colonel Fleming; he had practiced "medicine and surgery" in Staunton from 1760 to 1769.³⁶

The British hopefully continued the war, even though Cornwallis had surrendered. They continued to occupy New York and Charleston for many months, and there were isolated skirmishes keeping both sides alert. But by the order of the British House of Commons, in March 1782, negotiations for peace were undertaken. The Treaty of Paris was concluded and signed September 3, 1783.

The Americans at the peace table became suspicious of the French members because of their partiality to Spain. Therefore, contrary to instructions from Congress to follow the advice of France, the delegates negotiated an agreement with the British emissaries on recognition "of independence and very favorable boundaries."³⁷ France and Spain wanted the western boundary to follow the crest of the Alleghany Mountains. Instead, the new nation, the United States of America, was bounded on the north by the present Canadian border, on the west by the Mississippi River and on the south by Spanish Florida.³⁸

The thing that gives the Revolutionary War renowned significance to Virginia is not only the part she had in the war but also the preeminent part she played in developing the principles of the peace after victory.³⁹

First, the Virginian wanted to live an unhampered, unmolested life. The man who in his day personified this life was General Anthony Wayne. His courage and daring in taking Stony Point from the British earned him the title, "Mad Anthony." Only his patriotic spirit led him, when he was ill, to undertake the final great battle against the western Indians at Fallen Timbers, where he won in spite of Spain's effort to sabotage the campaign. His was the final blow that removed the Indian threat and allowed the Valley people to live in peace.⁴⁰ He became the hero of the day and, it is said, escaped being the second president of the United States only by death in 1796. The town of Teasville on the South River in Augusta became the city of Waynesboro in honor of this man. It is a constant reminder to the county of one of the great spirits of the Revolution. Wayne was a Pennsylvanian.

In the second place, the war was fought for the natural rights of man. Through the war the principles of civic freedom and religious liberty were being studied as well as defended. After the peace, toleration alone was not sufficient. The liberal thinking Thomas Jefferson secured the appointment of the arch non-conformist, Zechariah Johnston—the farmer from Fishersville—to head the all-important Committee on Religion in the Virginia Assembly. When Jefferson was occupied with other matters of state, Mr. Madison steered his "Act for establishing

Religious Freedom" through the Virginia Assembly. In spite of strong opposition led by Patrick Henry, the bill passed, and a student of the debate says, "Johnston was Madison's second in command." And this pattern of religious freedom became the pattern for America.⁴¹

The ratification of the Federal constitution was a third development after the war in which Augusta County made a contribution. Zechariah Johnston and Alexander Stuart were the Augusta County representatives in the Virginia convention to consider the proposed Federal constitution. They took the lead and controlled the fourteen Valley votes, when the remainder of the state vote opposed ratification 79 to 75. A forceful speech by Johnston and the casting of all fourteen Valley votes for ratification placed Virginia among the states supporting an effective Federal constitution.⁴²

There are phases, however, of the Valley struggle and its results that tend to humility, if not humiliation. The Cavalier Virginia gentleman and the Indian-fighting frontiersman were side by side in devotion to the Revolution for independence. But the latter was not always a welcomed partner. Berkeley County, Virginia, with its 40 per cent Scotch-Irish population, became the home of Major General Charles Lee about the outbreak of the war. General Lee was second only to Washington in the Continental Army. At the battle of Monmouth in 1778, with Washington depending on him, Lee retreated without reason. This brought violent censure from fellow officers and ultimately a discharge from army service. The experience embittered the eccentric Virginian. He was one of few to express strong indignation against the emerging Scotch-Irish position in Virginia affairs. His indelicate language no doubt came from violent feelings when he said,

"We in Virginia live (if it can be called living) neither under Monarchy, Aristocracy nor Democracy—if it deserved any name it is a Macocracy, that is, a Banditti of Scotch-Irish Servants or their immediate descendants (whose names generally begin with Mac) are our Lords and Rulers." Revealing that this was a deliberate resentment, he added in the conclusion of his will, his final request, "I desire most earnestly, that I may

not be buried in any church, or churchyard, or within a mile of any Presbyterian or Anabaptist meeting house; for since I have resided in this country, I have kept so much bad company when living that I do not chuse to continue it when dead."⁴³

The "Scotch-Irish servants," as General Lee called them, were by no means "Rulers," for their number in legislative halls was a small minority. But their effort and influence were a major factor in helping form the American way of life. The 90 per cent Dissenter population—German and Scotch-Irish—of old Augusta County (now Rockbridge, Rockingham and Augusta) believed in and fought, on battlefields and in legislative halls, for the freedom of people to be under laws of their own making and the natural right to do anything that did not harm another. They supported with zeal the theory of natural rights based on laws that were sustained by divine sanction. The outcome of their struggle supplied the majority support for Jefferson, Madison, and Mason, who put Virginia in the lead in gaining independence, in forming an effective Constitution, and in declaring a Bill of Rights.

Dr. Samuel Eliot Morison in his recent *History of the American People* puts this achievement in perspective when he writes: "The proper way, they felt, to secure liberty to posterity was to set up a representative government, limited in scope by a statement of natural rights with which no government may meddle. Consequently, every state constitution included a bill of rights. The first, Virginia's, was drafted by George Mason and adopted by the Virginia convention on June 12, 1776.

"This Virginia Declaration of Rights," Dr. Morison continues, "is one of the great liberty documents of all time. It applied the past experience of free-born Englishmen, and parented not only all other American bills of rights, but the French *Declaration* . . . of 1789 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Virginia begins by asserting, 'That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot . . . deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety'."⁴⁴

Footnotes

1. Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 212.
2. Howard McKnight Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring: Headwater of Freedom*. Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1954, p. 43.
3. Richard L. Morton, *Colonial Virginia, Volume II, Westward Expansion and Prelude to Revolution, 1710-1763*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960, pp. 635-48.
4. Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, pp. 134, 144, 149.
5. Lyman C. Draper Manuscripts, item IQQ83, "The Preston Register for Augusta County, 1754-1758," State Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin.
6. John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1761-1765*. Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1907, pp. xx-xxv; Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, p. 167.
7. Morison, *History of the American People*, pp. 196, 210.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 181-82.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 186, 203, 235-36.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
11. Jos. A. Waddell, *Annals of Augusta County, Virginia from 1726 to 1871*. Staunton: C. Russell Caldwell, 1902, p. 218.
12. John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1773-1776*. Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1905, pp. xv, 132; William Henry Foote, *Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical*. Volume I; Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1850, I, 325; John Richard Alden, *The South in the Revolution, 1763-1789*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957, p. 173.
13. Kennedy, *Journals*, p. 97; Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, pp. 181-91.
14. Freeman H. Hart, *The Valley of Virginia in the American Revolution, 1763-1789*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942, pp. 79-80.
15. Livia Nye Simpson-Poffenbarger, *The Battle of Point Pleasant*. Point Pleasant: The State Gazette, 1909, 141 pp.; William Henry Foote, *Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical*. Volume II; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincot & Co., 1855, pp. 159-68.
16. Simpson-Poffenbarger, *The Battle*, pp. 9, 35.
17. Alden, *The South in the Revolution*, pp. 138-39; Robert G. Albion and Leonidas Dodson, eds., *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775-1776*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934, pp. 24-25, 135.
18. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, p. 84.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-87.
20. Waddell, *Annals of Augusta County*, pp. 235-36.
21. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, p. 7.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-10.
26. Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, p. 199.

27. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, pp. v, 95.
28. Lyman Chalkley, *Chronicle of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia, Extracted from the Original Court Records of Augusta County, 1745-1800*. Three Volumes; Rosslyn, Virginia: Published by Mary S. Lockwood, 1912, II, 475-76.
29. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, pp. 102-07.
30. Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, pp. 201-02.
31. Chalkley, *Records of Augusta County*, I, 506-07.
32. *Ibid.*, I, 505-06.
33. *Ibid.*, I, 507.
34. Foote, *Sketches*, I, 453.
35. Wilson, *The Tinkling Spring*, pp. 203-04; Waddell, *Annals of Augusta*, p. 298.
36. Waddell, *Annals of Augusta*, pp. 295-96; Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, pp. 88-89; *Journal of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1776-1790*, Richmond: Printed by Thomas W. White, 1828, p. 10 of the 1781 Journal.
37. Alden, *The South in the Revolution*, p. 305; Morison, *History of the American People*, pp. 266-67.
38. Carington Bowles, *Map of the United States of America; as settled by The Preliminary Articles of Peace, signed at Versailles the 20th Jan'y 1783*. At his Map & Print Warehouse, 1784. From the Library of Congress.
39. Alden, *The South in the Revolution*, pp. 393-400.
40. J. Lewis Peyton, *History of Augusta County, Virginia*. Staunton: Samuel M. Yost & Son, 1882, pp. 192, 209-10.
41. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, pp. 138-40.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 179-82; Alden, *The South in the Revolution*, pp. 317-18.
43. Hart, *The Valley in the Revolution*, p. 109.
44. Morison, *History of the American People*, pp. 271-73.

LEE AND JACKSON

Address of Dr. Marshall Moore Brice

Delivered for Lee-Jackson Day

Staunton Kiwanis Club, January 17, 1966

In the Friday, March 31, 1865, issue of the Staunton *Spectator* appears the reprint of a letter written to the New York *Mercury* by a patriotic citizen of the United States, a man unreservedly devoted to his country in its war against the Confederate States of America. The theme of the letter is that, despite the march of Sherman through Georgia and the Carolinas, despite the fall of Savannah and Wilmington and Charleston, despite the conquest of the Shenandoah Valley and the sealing off of the port of Mobile, despite the undeniable fact that the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia was shrinking while its counterpart, the Federal Army of the Potomac, was growing and becoming better equipped, there still remained the hair-trigger danger that the unpredictable leader of the Southern armies, General Robert Edward Lee, would launch out in a massive attack that would negativize all the formerly supposed advantages of the Union position. The writer of this letter, in his references to this Southern leader, comments, "We do not consider it treason, we do not speak it as disloyal, when we say that Robert E. Lee, the commander of the Rebel forces, is all that constitutes a strategist, in all that goes to make a general able to dare and fight down fate itself—the first and foremost in the country." And the Union writer of the letter goes on to commend Lee with the concluding phrase, the "grandeur, the sublime heroism of that grey-haired genius, the descendant and culmination of a line of patriots."

Less than two years before that, this same Staunton *Spectator* had reprinted another letter from another Northern citizen, who referred to General Thomas Jonathan Jackson as the epitome of tactical and strategic audacity, coupling energy with artistry, perspicacity with simplicity, aggressiveness with caution, and added that his piety and devotion burned increasingly bright in his leadership of his troops in battle. This also was written, I repeat, by a loyal Northern citizen and was published less than

a month before that great leader, Jackson, after completion of perhaps his most audacious maneuver, was struck down at the very height of a military fame enjoyed at that hour by no other Civil War figure, at the very zenith of Confederate success.

This week we are commemorating the birthdays of these two great Americans. Robert E. Lee was born January 19, 1807, Stonewall Jackson January 21, 1824. During their war years beginning in 1861 they came to attain regional and world recognition. And yet they were leaders of armies which ultimately yielded in defeat. It is an accepted maxim that there is no substitute for victory; and as we know, all too often the vanquished is eclipsed not only on the field of battle, but in distinction, in repute, in esteem and approbation. As great Captains of the Lost Cause, Lee and Jackson for the past century have been scrupulously investigated, their characters assailed with rancor and venom, every facet of their lives held up to the white light of critical inspection. And strangely enough, this meticulously intense scrutiny has succeeded only in bringing out new virtues, of investing them with more perfectly rounded characters. The result is that, a century after their human presences have become memories, they have attained unto a stature higher and even more unblemished than before. Every new character study seems to add cumulated greatness to their names.

In great measure the history of Robert E. Lee and of Stonewall Jackson is the history of their native state, their native land, during a critical period. Both had been reared with the ideal of strong adherence to constitutional liberty. Both had completed the arduous course of study and training at the United States Military Academy, West Point, and there had been imbued with the code of integrity that came to be woven like a brilliant thread through the warp and woof of their careers. Both had served their nation in peace and war; both had shared in the battle array and carnage of the war with Mexico. And yet there were some exceptional and intriguing differences between these two men. The older, Robert E. Lee, reared in the cultured environment of eastern Virginia, in the aristocratic traditions of that region, was able to trace his ancestry and connections back to the Father of his Country and also to one of the distinguished generals of the Revolutionary War. The younger, Thomas J. Jackson, was brought up in the thinly populated Appalachian area of western Virginia, one whose family back-

ground was far from exalted, which could not number among its members any of the ranking family groups of the Commonwealth. In respect to circumstances a century and a half ago, Jackson could be termed virtually a man of the frontier. Yet these two men, so remarkably different in certain aspects of background, so similar in others, were brought together to work out one of the most extraordinarily operative military teams in the annals of warfare.

As designers of maneuver, as sculptors of action, as devisers of the venturesome separation of forces in the face of the enemy, Lee and Jackson can hardly find their compeers in the records of warfare. On five separate occasions General Lee divided his undermanned Army of Northern Virginia while confronting a superior opposing force, sending Jackson far away, only to reunite those armies at the crucial time and in the critical area in the arena of conflict. In each of those five instances it was Stonewall Jackson who was detached to make the long enveloping march away from the main army. I like to bring to mind that intricate maneuver of Second Manassas in August 1862, how Jackson, with his small corps, marched around and to the rear of Union General Pope's army, a distance of 57 miles in two days, his own army fighting an engagement at the immediate conclusion of the march; and how, only a few days later, Lee brought his own larger forces to fall in line with Jackson on the field of battle west of Groveton. And I like to review what is perhaps the most startling of those five turning movements, the last one in which Jackson was to engage, when he swung his corps past Union General Hooker's right, on to the very left flank at Chancellorsville, and launched his fierce onset, while Lee held the foe to the south.

It is an axiom of military science that division of inferior forces in the face of a strong enemy is, of its very nature, a perilous procedure. We may be confident that these two generals, with their exceptional military training and experience, were fully aware of the peril hovering over them. Yet so fine an army had they fashioned, so thoroughly were their own operations coordinated, that they never held less than calm confidence in their own success. And in each of these five maneuvers they were eminently successful.

One of the enigmas, one of the questions asked by students of military lore is the inevitable one as to which of the two do

we owe the inception of the plans. Actually it is hardly more than an academic question, of little importance. Whether it was Lee or Jackson who conceived initially of the maneuvers, it was of course Lee, commander of the army, who was responsible for the success or failure of the strategy. And whether it was Lee or Jackson who devised the long turning and flanking marches, we may be sure that, had the maneuvers failed, Jackson would have borne the brunt of criticism for his individual rebuff. Nevertheless, it is significant that, after his loss of Jackson at Chancellorsville, General Robert E. Lee never again divided and reunited his army in the field as he had done while his daring lieutenant could put the movement into operation.

These, then, were the two great soldiers of whom America can well take its full share of glory, soldiers whose campaigns are still being studied as models of military science and tactics, soldiers whose fame as military men transcended the cause for which they sacrificed. History may be explored with futility to discover the superior of these two soldiers, and at the most, only in a few instances in the mystic threads of time may their equals be recorded. For their military prowess and acumen alone they rank high in our esteem, in the world's esteem; for there is some spark in all human beings that finds stimulus in the pageant of military prowess. Still, there is more than proficiency in the glamorous roar of battle that lends grandeur to these two figures. Through the recriminations of enmity, the fierce assaults upon their characters, their names have survived unblemished, untarnished, shining brightly. During the past century they have attained unto enduring fame, not only in their embattled Confederacy, but also in the land of their enemies, in lands beyond the foreign seas. They have become the heritage of Virginia, of the Southern people, of Americans, of the world. And their characters extending beyond their military endeavors have contributed much to this recognition. They have attained the heights where they epitomize the great and the good and the virtuous in what became finally the lost cause.

Stonewall Jackson in 1861 emerged from near-obscurity as instructor in a small college, and within two years had grown into a people's hero, a nation's shining hope. He had the peculiar distinction of maintaining that high position of a hero who did not fail. He found his place in the hearts of people not only because of his military achievements, but because he was an example of devotion to his God, to duty, to his native land, a devo-

tion undimmed by wasted campaigns. Coupled with the strict honesty, the fundamental firmness, and the ready self-reliance of the frontiersman were a nobility of personality and unaffected piety. In the conception of Stonewall Jackson that has found its way into human hearts is that elevation of duty to the basic force in his daily life.

Lord Garnet Wolseley, then a lieutenant colonel, later a field marshal in the British army, interviewed Stonewall Jackson shortly after the battle of Antietam in 1862 and, in an article dispatched to English newspapers, quite interestingly characterized the two generals and their soldiers' attitude toward them: "Whilst General Lee is regarded in the light of infallible Jove, a man to be revered, Jackson is loved and adored with all the childlike and trustful affection which the ancients are said to have lavished upon the particular deity presiding over their affairs. The feeling of the soldiers for General Lee resembles that which Wellington's troops entertained for him—namely a fixed and unalterable faith in all he does and a calm confidence of victory while serving under him. But Jackson, like Napoleon, is idealized with that intense fervor which, consisting of mingled personal and devoted loyalty, cause them to meet death for his sake and bless him while dying."

And another Virginia general, George Pickett, in his blunt fashion, expressed his opinion of the two generals when he declared: "If General Lee had Grant's resources, he would soon end the war; but old Jack could have done it without resources."

The history of Lee is the history of the South during and immediately after the Civil War. He led an army composed of the best that the South possessed, of virtually all that the South possessed; and it is a tribute to him that General Grant could affirm during the closing months of the war, "General Lee is always a dangerous man on the battlefield." Through the decades of the past century Lee has perhaps grown into too much of an image, is too elevated as a kind of remote idol. Yet by no means was he a man of stern aloofness. In spite of his gravity, of an occasional solemnity that verged upon austerity, he was a most human type, mingling affability and humor with his busy exertions. Still, in truth, it is difficult not to make an image of him. In the world of ideals in which men live and endure and seek inspiration to lift them above their workaday lives, he endures as strength to the human heart, as a symbol of the rich worth of sacrifice. He, too, elevated duty to the fundamental

force of daily life. In his simple devoutness, his gentle courtesy, his impartial and humane judgment was a stability that ennobled his lustre. It has been said quite appropriately that he possessed Plato's calm, Sidney's highmindedness, and the constancy of William the Silent. Possibly the grandest short tribute that has been paid to his memory is that uttered by Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill: "He was Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward."

So at this time it is most appropriate that we turn away for awhile from our daily concerns to direct our thoughts and memories back to these two men who may well serve as inspirational examples to all, symbolizing as they do those high virtues, those rare and pure qualities that we have come to cherish as shining beacons to light our pathways. It may be true, as some hold, that we Americans of this mid-twentieth century accept too readily materialistic success as the measure of superiority, that we do not prize highly enough those cardinal virtues of probity, integrity, rectitude, that too swiftly do we gauge the stature of a man by the degree to which he forges ahead in the world of men. If such is true, it should be the hope and prayer of every American that this attitude may be only a temporary one, that eventually we will return to the day when truth and duty, when piety and devotion, when highmindedness and courage and faith will be restored to their proper niches in the echelon of virtues. In the meantime we have before us these two imposing examples of men whose pure hearts made them zealously willing to fling aside comfort and success, well-being, and esteem for careers of devotion to their duty and their ideals.

Robert Edward Lee and Thomas Jonathan Jackson were in many respects contrasting characters, dissimilar in background, in heritage, in fortune; but in the vast panorama of existence there was a pattern of kinship that binds them together in our minds and hearts and souls. In the nobility of their characters, in the unalloyed steadfastness of their faith and creed, in the simple adherence to duty and truth and reverence was a model that all may aspire to emulate. About each may we well repeat those lines which we often quote as typifying any life of noble grandeur:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man.'

Officers

Harry L. Nash, Jr.	<i>President</i>
Dr. Herbert S. Turner	<i>Vice-President</i>
Miss Elizabeth H. Perry	<i>Recording Secretary</i>
Mrs. R. Morris Armistead	<i>Corresponding Secretary</i>
William W. Huffman	<i>Treasurer</i>
Dr. Howard M. Wilson	<i>Archivist</i>
Dr. Patricia H. Menk	<i>Associate Archivist</i>
Dr. Franklin M. Hanger	<i>Assistant Archivist</i>

Directors

Dr. Marshall M. Brice	Mrs. Thornton W. Hankins
Fitzhugh Elder, Jr.	Dr. Richard P. Bell III
Mrs. Carter L. Loth	Mrs. Beirne J. Kerr

Life Members

Mrs. William Wayt Gibbs	W. Purviance Tams, Jr.
Dr. James S. Murphy	Joseph B. Yount III

Sustaining Members

Mr. & Mrs. William Frazier	Mr. & Mrs. Joseph R. Nutt, Jr.
Dr. & Mrs. Franklin M. Hanger	Dr. & Mrs. Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.

Contributing Members

Layton W. Yancey

Annual Members

William B. Alwood III	John Alton Brown
Mrs. Perry Archer	Colonel Rudolph Bumgardner, Jr.
Mrs. Thomas W. Atkinson	Tilghman Howard Bunch
	Mrs. G. Hal Burnett
Mrs. Emmett W. Barger	Mrs. Seth Burnley
The Rev. Nat G. Barnhart	
Mrs. W. L. Bashaw, Jr.	Miss Jane McClellan Allen Caldwell
Mrs. Gleaves C. Beard, Jr.	Miss Ann Barron Carroll
Miss Lillian H. Bell	Dr. Mary Swan Carroll
Mrs. Richard P. Bell, Sr.	Mrs. Clay Michie Catlett
Frank O. Birdsall	Mrs. R. E. Christian*
Dr. Marshall M. Brice	Mrs. Silva E. Clem

*Deceased

Edwin F. Conger
William A. Crawford

Mrs. Hal D. Davis
Mrs. William L. Davis
The Rev. George West Diehl

Mrs. John M. Echols
Robert Craig Effinger
Fitzhugh Elder, Jr.

3 ✓ Mrs. W. T. Francisco
Irvin Frazier

Mrs. William L. Gardner
Mrs. John Lewis Gibbs
Miss Nannie Lewis Gibbs
Mrs. A. Crawford Gilkeson
Mrs. Harold B. Gill
J. Paul Glick, Sr.

Richard M. Hamrick, Jr.
Mrs. Thornton W. Hankins
C. James Harrison III
Thomas Harry, Jr.
Mrs. Chrystabel C. Hartless
Thomas G. Hawpe
O. Clyde Hemp
Mrs. John Minor Hinch
Mrs. Howard T. Holden
Mrs. Charles A. Holt, Jr.
Col. Henry Winston Holt
Mrs. John W. Hoover
Mrs. Thomas D. Howie
William W. Huffman
Mrs. Clarence G. Hull, Jr.

Mrs. Walter C. Jones

Mrs. Beirne J. Kerr
Mrs. A. Franklin Kibler
Mrs. James J. King
Miss Helena Craig Koiner

Mrs. Clyde M. Lambert
Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster
Miss Bessie Wallace Landes
Richard Scott (Jack) Lewis
A. Thomas Loving

Percy C. Manley
Miss M. Estelle Martin
Mrs. Clemmer L. Miller
Mrs. R. Strickler Moffett
Mrs. William Stuart Moffett
Mrs. J. F. Moomaw

Miss Mary Evelyn McChesney
Zack A. McChesney
Miss Mary McKim McCue
Miss Sarah W. McCue

Mrs. William C. Owen

Mrs. Campbell Pancake
Frank A. Pannill
Mrs. Edward L. Parker
Mrs. Alexander McC. Patch
Miss Elizabeth H. Perry
Mrs. James B. Pettis
Richard C. Peyton

Mrs. Carl Riddlebarger
Thoburn H. Roane
Archibald G. Robertson
Mrs. George Wilson Robinson
Mrs. Charles S. Roller, Jr.
Mrs. George S. Rosenberger

Dr. Randolph T. Shields, Jr.
Mrs. Dorothy E. Shuey
Mrs. Claude P. Smith
William H. Sipe
Mrs. Herbert McKelden Smith
Mrs. Mildred Taylor Smith
Dr. McKelden Smith
Richard Bull Smith
Mrs. Horace A. Soper
Dr. James Sprunt
Mrs. Lawrence B. Steele
Ronald L. Steffey
Mrs. S. Tate Sterrett
Miss Fannie B. Strauss
Wayne A. Switzer

Colin J. S. Thomas, Jr.
Robert D. Thompson
Joseph W. Timberlake, Jr.

Miss Helen Siebold Walter
Barlow Ware
Gen. Morris T. Warner
Mrs. Erskine M. Weller
James C. Wheat
Miss Eleanor L. White

Miss Elizabeth Houston Williams
Mrs. Robert F. Woodson
Mrs. Clarke Worthington
Mrs. Samuel B. Wright

James Kimble Young, Jr.

Family Members

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Morris Armistead
Mr. & Mrs. Fritz C. Hamer
Mr. & Mrs. Richard D. Hamilton
Mrs. Harry H. Hevener &
H. Henderson Hevener
Mr. & Mrs. Walter L. Hickok
Mr. & Mrs. Charles S. Hunter, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. William Gibbs Kable
Mr. & Mrs. Charles E. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. J. Harold Kivlighan
Mr. & Mrs. J. J. Kivlighan
Mr. & Mrs. E. Lewis Knowles

Mr. & Mrs. Mayo Cabell
Mr. & Mrs. J. Waller Callison
Mr. & Mrs. Richard C. Catlett
Mr. & Mrs. George Moffett Cochran
William Warren Coleman & family
Mr. & Mrs. Fletcher Collins, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. John S. Cowl
Misses Annie Lee &
Frances Crawford

Mr. & Mrs. Horace T. Day
Col. & Mrs. Herbert D. Deane
Mr. & Mrs. John McKee Dunlap, Jr.

Misses Lillian W. and Winifred
Eisenberg

Mr. & Mrs. Harry Frazier, Jr.

Dr. & Mrs. Charles F. Gaylord
Mr. & Mrs. William Wayt Gibbs IV
Mr. & Mrs. Neal S. Goodloe
Dr. & Mrs. Thomas H. Grafton
Dr. & Mrs. John Hiner Guss

Mr. & Mrs. Waller C. Lescure
Dr. & Mrs. Frank Bell Lewis
Mr. & Mrs. Carter Lewis Loth
Col. & Mrs. Roy F. Lynd

Mr. & Mrs. Theodore S. Mandeville
Dr. & Mrs. Karl Menk
Judge & Mrs. William Stuart
Moffett, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. Wallace M. Montgomery
Mr. & Mrs. William Whiting Moore
Dr. & Mrs. Edward James Mortell
Mr. & Mrs. Joseph S. Moyer

Mr. & Mrs. John M. McChesney, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. Richard Fontaine
McPherson

Mr. & Mrs. Harry L. Nash, Jr.

Mr. & Mrs. Samuel L. Obenchain
Gen. & Mrs. E. Walton Opie

Mr. & Mrs. William James Perry

Dr. & Mrs. Alex F. Robertson Dr. Hugh H. Trout & family
Dr. & Mrs. H. St. George Tucker
Mrs. A. Gilkeson Simpkins & Family Dr. & Mrs. Herbert S. Turner
Mr. & Mrs. William W. Sproul, Jr.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert B. Taylor Mr. & Mrs. Gilpin Willson, Jr.
Mr. & Mrs. Stephen D. Timberlake Dr. & Mrs. Howard M. Wilson
Mr. & Mrs. Wayt Bell Timberlake Col. & Mrs. Herman Work



